

REMARKS-General

The newly drafted independent claims 58 to 69 incorporate all structural limitations of the original claim 1 and include further limitations previously brought forth in the disclosure. No new matter has been included. All new claims 58 to 69 are submitted to be of sufficient clarity and detail to enable a person of average skill in the art to make and use the instant invention, so as to be pursuant to 35 USC 112.

With regard to the rejection of record based on prior art, Applicant will advance arguments to illustrate the manner in which the invention defined by the newly introduced claims is patentably distinguishable from the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

Response to Rejection of Claims 46 to 57 under 35USC103

The Examiner rejected claims 46 to 57 over Stanford (US 6,112,674) in view of Virtue et al. (US 2,278,810), Palmer (US 4,825,781), Pinch (US 6,058,853), and Witkowiak (US 2,695,828). Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 103:

“(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is **not identically** disclosed or described as set forth in **section 102 of this title**, if the **differences** between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the **subject matter as a whole would have been obvious** at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.”

In view of 35 U.S.C. 103(a), it is apparent that to be qualified as a prior art under 35USC103(a), the prior art must be cited under 35USC102(a)~(g) but the disclosure of the prior art and the invention are not identical and there are one or more differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art. In addition, such differences between the subject matter sought to be patented **as a whole** and the prior art are obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains.

In other words, the differences between the subject matter sought to be patent as a whole of the instant invention and Stanford which is qualified as prior art of the

instant invention under 35USC102(b) are obvious in view of Virtue et al., Palmer, Pinch, and Witkowiak at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains.

The applicant respectfully identifies the unobvious differences between the instant invention and the various cited arts as follows:

(a) Referring to the newly amended claim 58, Stanford discloses a utility table which comprises a tabletop, a pair of support pedestals, a frame, two pivot support braces, and a retention member. Stanford fails to teach that the supporting arms can be of L-shaped structure. Palmer discloses a collapsible table comprising two L-shaped leg members. It is claimed that it would have been obvious to combine Stanford with Palmer for forming a banquet table comprising two L-shaped supporting arms. The applicant respectfully submits that there are a number of reasons which tend to show that it would **not have been obvious** for one skilled in the art to combine Stanford with Palmer to form the instant invention.

First, Palmer discloses a collapsible table having a circular table top. The disclosed leg members are provided underneath the table top for supporting an entire surface area thereof (Palmer, Fig. 1). There is no need to reinforce the mid portion of the circular table top because it does not have a rectangular structure wherein the leg frames are pivotally mounted at two ends portions of that rectangular structure. Thus, Palmer does not suggest, teach or motivate the use of the leg members in a table having a rectangular table top structure.

Second, Palmer's table is collapsible on the **condition** that one of the leg members should be detached from the circular table top. In other words, Palmer does not in any way teach, suggest, or motivate folding of the table **without** detaching the one of the leg members. It seems that the very reason for detaching the leg members from the table top in Palmer's patent is that the leg members (i.e. the supporting arms in the instant invention) cannot be folded into a compact size if the leg members are not detachable.

(b) Referring to the newly amended claims 62, 63, 66 and 69, it has been suggested by the Examiner that the instant invention would have been obvious to one skilled in the art over Stanford in view of Pinch regarding the number of attachment

holes and the guiding slots. Pinch discloses a foldable table which comprises a first and a second table sections pivotally folded with toward each other for folding the entire table in a compact size. Both Stanford and Pinch do not concern with reinforcement of the overall structural integrally of the foldable or the utility table. The applicant respectfully clarifies that the attachment arrangement is for ***enhancing the reinforcing ability*** of the supporting arms of the banquet table of the instant invention by evenly distributing the loading exerted onto the rectangular top panel. The combination of Stanford and Pinch does not teach, suggest or motivate the use of the attachment arrangement for enhancing the reinforcing ability of the supporting arms simply because both Stanford and Pinch do not concern with reinforcing the mid-portion of the rectangular top panel. Since the mid-portion of the top panel is reinforced by the supporting arms, the extent to which the loading to the top panel is evenly distributed and transmitted to the supporting arms substantially affects the structural integrity of the top panel, especially at the mid-portion.


The Cited but Non-Applied References

The cited but not relied upon references have been studied and are greatly appreciated, but are deemed to be less relevant than the relied upon references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested. Allowance of claims 58 to 69 at an early date is solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed in order to place the application in condition for allowance, he is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Raymond Y. Chan
Reg. Nr.: 37,484
108 N. Ynez Ave.
Suite 128
Monterey Park, CA 91754
Tel.: 1-626-571-9812
Fax.: 1-626-571-9813

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this corresponding is being deposited with the United States Postal Service by First Class Mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" on the date below.

Date: 06/20/2007

Signature: 
Person Signing: Steven Cheung